

22 August 1969

MEMORANDUM FOR: Lieutenant General Cushman
Mr. Bross

SUBJECT : Talking Paper for Conference with ASD (A)

1. The following paragraphs outline material to be discussed in your forthcoming conference with Mr. Froehlke, ASD (A) in his new capacity as the OSD Special Assistant for Intelligence.

INTRODUCTION

2. Discussion of the role of the NIRB and what the Board is doing and proposes to do hopefully will provide basis for examination of the ASD (A) intelligence needs and how these can best be supported through the NIRB mechanism. Mr. Froehlke's needs, as derived from his 29 July memorandum to the Secretary of Defense, are seen as including:

a) a means to compare resources in one program targeted against a requirement with resources on the same requirement in another program (p. 2);

b) a means for making comparisons and appropriate trade-offs between major intelligence activities and programs (p. 3).

c) a means to evaluate information requirements in terms of intelligence objectives (p. 2);

d) a means to determine the minimum level of information that will satisfy a stated requirement--and to ascertain requirements as precisely as possible (p. 4);

e) a means to determine the risks involved in acceptance of alternate or reduced levels of efforts (p. 4);

f) a means to determine the value of information in relation to expenditures to acquire it (not expressly stated but implied throughout);

g) a means to focus attention on decisive points in the Consolidated Defense Intelligence Program by developing major issue studies on resource allocation and management (p. 3);

h) a means to pull together and maintain a Five Year Defense Intelligence Plan (p. 3); and

i) a means to keep track of changes in programs within the program year which alter costs and resource distribution (implied by Froehle; stated in Helms' letter of 22 July).

3. Meeting these needs will require a tremendous amount of work on the part of the NIRB staff and various elements of the USIB structure along with the ASD (A) intelligence staff. This will put a premium on close working relationships and effective coordination between the ASD (A) intelligence staff and those elements directly supporting the DCI. In many ways, the Target Oriented Display should prove to be a basic working tool for all concerned in intelligence resource use.

TARGET ORIENTED DISPLAY (TOD)

4. If the NIRB is to assess the need for resources to support the foreign intelligence effort, it must have access to costing information

which is related to objectives and purposes and not solely to units and systems. Sound advice on questions relating to development, procurement and utilization of resources requires a detailed funding breakout which can be related to specific target objectives. The examination of the appropriateness of various funding levels requires a means of looking at alternatives. To enable resource issue analysis and study, the DCI/NIPE, working with an interagency TOD Committee, has been charged with the development of a TOD, basic inputs to which are derived from the five-year Consolidated Intelligence Program, Consolidated Cryptologic Program, National Reconnaissance Program and Central Intelligence Agency Program.

5. Considerable progress has been made, but the TOD still is far from the basic working tool that it is expected to become if continuing effort is applied to refinements of its programs. The key element of the TOD is its breakout of funds in terms of intelligence subjects, geographic areas and sensors. (1)

25X1

d. Intelligence subjects ~~xxxxxx~~ for each geographic target area broken out as: POL-ECON-SOCIOLOG (non-military), SCI & TECH (non-military), Other (non-military), Mapping, Charting and Geographic, and Military (including military economic and military scientific and technical)

e. Intelligence subject, in addition to those in d, for USSR and Communist China targets only as follows: Strategic ^{Forces} ~~xxxx~~-Offensive, Strategic Forces-Defensive, General Purpose Forces-Air, General Purpose Forces-Ground, General Purpose Forces-Naval, Military Command and Control, Military Special Weapons, Military Space Programs, and Undistributed (military).

4. Costs under each of the geographic and subject headings are divided into R&D, investment and expenses classified as R&D, investment or expenses.

39

6. Several questions relating to TOD require decisions particularly since the ASD (A) is creating his own intelligence staff:

a. Should the TOD effort continue? This answer should be a firm "Yes". To date the TOD program has been largely devised by the staff charged with bringing it into being and consumer interplay with the TOD is only just beginning, but the outlook is quite encouraging. The CIP and CIAP data are already proving quite useful. Additional development of the TOD is going to depend, however, on the extent to which meaningful breakout can be made of data from the CCP and the NRP. The specific kind of analyses which may develop hinges in large part on the extent to which confidence develops in the basic reality of the cost data extractable from the TOD program. In particular, though, the TOD should make areas of parallel development more clearly identifiable, should reveal any redundancies calling for closer detailed examination, and should make potential areas of trade-off more apparent than is presently the case.

Wing *garden*
b. Where is the optimum location for the TOD? Its present location in the DCI/NIPE organization appears most suitable, even though the bulk of the inputs are from OSD programs. TOD inputs are actually community-wide and should be under DCI aegis. Close DCI/NIPE-ASD (A) interplay can be fostered by attachment of a DCI/NIPE staff member thoroughly knowledgeable of the TOD to the ASD (A) staff or having a liaison officer from the ASD (A) staff in the TOD office.

25X1

Approved For Release 2006/02/07 : CIA-RDP86M00612R000100060030-5

Approved For Release 2006/02/07 : CIA-RDP86M00612R000100060030-5

Draft/10/1/69
22 Aug 69

6. c. How Should the TOD Effort be Manned

The present structure for producing the TOD is as follows. It is proposed that this structure be retained in its present form.

(1) Overall guidance and authority for carrying-on the community-wide TOD effort is derived from the Sponsors -- the Deputy Secretary of Defense, the Director, Bureau of the Budget, and the Director of Central Intelligence.

(2) Representatives of the Sponsors give closer direction to the TOD effort, meeting some 3 - 4 times yearly to review on-going efforts and to prescribe new guidelines. These are the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Administration (Mr. Froehlke) -- (it being assumed that the latter will replace Dr. Selin), the Assistant Director, BoB (Mr. Schlesinger), and the Deputy to the DCI for National Intelligence Programs Evaluation (Mr. Bross).

(3) The TOD Committee represents the three sponsors at the working level. This committee is chaired by a representative from the Office of the DCI (which also provides the Executive Secretariat), and the other two members are from the International Division, BoB and from the Office of the ASD (Administration). The TOD Committee carries on the detailed work of developing the methodology, common vocabulary, data call instructions, and display formats which taken together make possible the development of an organized data base cutting across traditional program and agency and service lines. The TOD Committee members are in daily contact; the Committee works effectively because of its small size and the continuity of its members. (Originally a much larger committee

~~SECRET~~

Approved For Release 2006/02/07 : CIA-RDP86M00612R000100060030-5

-- including representatives from several ASDs, program managers, and the service intelligence agencies -- was created; its size and diversity of viewpoints made it wholly ineffective and it was soon superseded by the present tripartite committee.)

(4) TOD Liaison Representatives are named by each of the program directors (e.g., Director, DIA for the CIP) to be the focal points for detailed arrangements with the TOD Committee. The latter works out, through the Liaison Representatives, detailed methodology for reporting information peculiar to individual programs consistent with the larger framework of a common, community-wide display.

(5) Computer hardware and software support has been provided, as a service of common concern, from resources controlled by the DCI. Assuming the continuation of the TOD (possibly with some revisions in format to relate it more closely to support the CDIP and NIRD), the complexity and lead time requirements for computer programming and machine output will make it necessary for the DCI to continue to provide the total computer support (including providing the output reports called for by all DoD consumers) for something like the next year. However, it is recommended that a plan be made and implemented as soon as possible whereby the Defense portion of this data base will eventually be maintained on DoD computers. (It may be that DIA is the appropriate organization to carry out this service in view of its responsibilities in the management of Defense Intelligence Data-Handling Systems and its responsibility for the production of Defense Intelligence as a substantive matter.)

The end objective is that the DCI's computers will continue to produce the community-wide data base and community-wide reports,

~~SECRET~~

Approved For Release 2006/02/07 : CIA-RDP86M00612R000100060030-5